

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Jeremy C. Hembree

PLAINTIFF

v.

Andrew M. Saul, Commissioner of  
Social Security

DEFENDANT

Case No. 6:18-cv-03364-TLW

**Order**

This social security matter now comes before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) filed by the magistrate judge to whom this case was assigned. ECF No. 18. In the Report, the magistrate judge recommends reversing the Commissioner's decision and remanding the case. The Commissioner filed a notice informing the Court that no objections would be filed. ECF No. 21. This matter is now ripe for decision.

The Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in the Report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. However, in the absence of objections, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, "a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident*

*Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Report. Having found no clear error on the face of the record, the Report is **ACCEPTED** and the Commissioner's decision is **REVERSED**. This case is **REMANDED** to the Commissioner for further proceedings consistent with the Report and this order.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

*s/ Terry L. Wooten*  
Terry L. Wooten  
Senior United States District Judge

February 19, 2020  
Columbia, South Carolina